For the Northern District of California

IN TH	HE UNITED	STATES 1	DISTRICT	COURT
50D MIII	NODELLED	N DISTRI	CIII OEI CI3	THODNES

No 00-4263 VRW ORDER

In re:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

QUINTUS SECURITIES LITIGATION

This order applies to:

17 ALL ACTIONS

18

The court is in receipt of the parties' joint motion to (1) restore this litigation to the court's active docket, (2) approve the parties' stipulation to add Quintus Corporation ("Quintus") as a named defendant solely for the purpose of consummating settlement of the litigation and (3) grant preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement. Doc #252.

The parties' joint motion is GRANTED IN PART. is DIRECTED to restore this litigation, including all related cases, to the court's active docket. Further, per the parties' For the Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

stipulation, id, Ex 2, Quintus is hereby ADDED as a named defendant for purposes of consummating the settlement of this litigation.

The court is not prepared to grant the parties' request for preliminary settlement approval on the basis of the extremely sketchy presentation the parties have made. See id at 3-5. court particularly requests greater detail on the basis for the plan of allocation and the fee award for which lead counsel "might decide to apply." Id at 4.

It is appropriate to resolve any issues surrounding the fee award before notice is sent to the class so the class can be apprised of the net recovery it can expect to receive. Accordingly, briefing should (1) explain why intervening Ninth Circuit authority extinguishes class counsel's implicit obligation to honor the fee arrangement upon which the court's designation of lead counsel was predicated, see generally <u>In re Quintus Sec Litig</u>, 148 F Supp 2d 967 (ND Cal 2001), and (2) discuss counsel's newly proposed fee award in accordance with the principles set forth in In re HPL Technologies Sec, Inc Litig, 366 F Supp 2d 912 (ND Cal 2005) (Walker, J).

Briefing shall not exceed twenty pages and shall be submitted on or before March 1, 2006.

SO ORDERED.

Villa

VAUGHN R WALKER

United States District Chief Judge